

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 768

UD 028 394

AUTHOR Pierce, Lorraine Valdez
TITLE Effective Schools for National Origin Language Minority Students.
INSTITUTION American Univ., Washington, DC. Mid-Atlantic Equity Center.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 55p.
AVAILABLE FROM The Mid-Atlantic Equity Center, 5010 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., Suite 310, Washington, DC 20016.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Policy; *Educational Quality; Effective Schools Research; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); Ethnic Groups; Hispanic Americans; *Limited English Speaking; *Minority Groups; *School Effectiveness; Second Language Instruction; Spanish Speaking; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS Chula Vista City School District CA; Corpus Christi Independent School District TX; *Language Minorities

ABSTRACT

This monograph examines effective schooling for language minority students through a review of current practices, an analysis of current thinking on related issues, and a look at actual exemplary schools and programs. The first section briefly reviews effective schools research as an introduction to the text. The second section looks in detail at instructional practices that preclude equity and excellence. This section also addresses practices that promote acquisition of English and understanding of and respect for cultural differences in the classroom. The third section is a re-analysis of the effective schools literature covering the following topics: (1) cultural pluralism; (2) parent participation; (3) shared governance; (4) academically rich programs; (5) skilled use and training of teachers; (6) personal attention to students; (7) student responsibility for school affairs; (8) an accepting and supportive environment; and (9) teaching aimed at preventing academic problems. The fourth section describes research that has been conducted on four effective programs and finds that these programs tend to reflect reciprocal interaction models rather than transmission oriented models of education. Other commonalities include curriculum that goes beyond basic skills, respect for cultural pluralism, staff development aimed at enabling teachers to deal with culturally different children, encouraging student collaboration in lesson planning and preparation, and shared school governance. Also included are a glossary of terms and 62 references. (JB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED338768



"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Denbo

Mid-Atlantic Equity
Center

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
ERIC position or policy.

00028 394

**Effective Schools
For
National Origin
Language Minority Students**

LORRAINE VALDEZ PIERCE, Ph.D.

**The Mid-Atlantic Equity Center
School of Education
The American University**

Copyright © 1991 by
The Mid-Atlantic Equity Center
5010 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., Suite 310
Washington, D.C. 20016

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of The Mid-Atlantic Equity Center.

The Mid-Atlantic Equity Center is a desegregation assistance center funded by the U.S. Department of Education under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Center provides technical assistance and training services to public schools in Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia in three program areas: Race, Sex, and National Origin Desegregation. Services include assistance to requesting schools and school districts in the form of development and implementation of school improvement plans, administrative briefings and consultations, staff development, inservice workshops, and curriculum review.

The National Origin Desegregation component provides assistance related to the equitable placement of national origin students in public schools and within those schools, including providing students of limited-English-proficiency with an opportunity for full participation in all educational programs.

National Origin technical assistance addresses legal compliance issues, program needs assessment, identification and placement of limited-English-proficient students in instructional programs, effective instructional practices for language minority and recent immigrant children, and program evaluation. Publications of the Mid-Atlantic Equity Center on educational issues of interest to teachers and administrators in the region are available upon request.



Sheryl Denbo, Ph.D., Executive Director

Learning to Persist/Persisting to Learn

Cross-Cultural Communication:
An Essential Dimension of
Effective Education

Improving Black Student Achievement
By Enhancing Students' Self-Image

Effective Schools for National Origin
Language Minority Students

MID-ATLANTIC EQUITY CENTER SERIES

*Dedicated to all national
origin language minority persons who
made it, in spite of the odds
against them.*

Foreword

The academic underachievement of minority students is documented by the large gap between standardized test scores of minority and majority students and by the continued high rate of suspension and dropout among Black and Hispanic teenagers. This underachievement of a large and growing segment of our population is nothing short of a national crisis.

By the year 2010, Blacks and Hispanics will comprise approximately 30 percent of our population. Labor force projections indicate a severe decline in the number of blue-collar jobs and a substantial increase in jobs that require high levels of technical skill. Given this economic picture, the crisis of underachieving minority students will become a central issue in determining our nation's economic survival. We can envision a large unemployed segment of the population and, simultaneously, a severe labor shortage in numerous highly skilled occupations. It is doubtful the United States can maintain world leadership under these conditions. As Americans and in our roles as educators, we must work together to ensure that equitable opportunities exist for all students. Minority children, like all children, should be given the opportunity to succeed.

Many factors have been cited for the underachievement of minority students, including economics, parents, community, and the environment. The Effective Schools Research makes it clear that whatever influence is exerted by these factors, schools can make a difference. Researchers who study effective schools have found schools serving lower-income neighborhoods where students' performance on standardized tests is average or above. While we may not be able to control other variables, evidence indicates that schools can have a significant impact on the minority students' academic performance.

Researchers have outlined effective instructional strategies, as well as analyzed characteristics of effective school districts, school buildings, classrooms, and teachers. With this in mind, The Mid-Atlantic Equity Center has designed this publication series to address essential characteristics of effective instruction identified by these researchers, including:

- (1) *Learning to Persist/Persisting to Learn*: teaching students to persist in their learning;
- (2) *Cross-Cultural Communication: An Essential Dimension of Effective Education*: understanding cultural diversity and its importance in the classroom;
- (3) *Improving Black Student Achievement By Enhancing Students' Self-Image*: helping Black students to build positive academic self-concepts; and
- (4) *Effective Schools for National Origin Language Minority Stu-*

dents: describing educational policies and practices which are effective with national origin students.

Learning to Persist/Persisting to Learn, the first in the series, assists teachers in improving the academic self-concept of minority students by helping teachers to: (1) understand why some students fail to successfully complete a task; (2) identify nonpersisting students; and (3) pinpoint curriculum and instructional strategies that can help students learn to persist. Persistence is a learned behavior, and students from lower-income families are more likely than their middle-income counterparts to observe adults who lack control of their environment and to view luck or chance as a more significant factor in success than effort or persistence. This publication helps educators teach students to cope with adversity and to persist in the successful completion of a task.

Cross-Cultural Communication: An Essential Dimension of Effective Education discusses cultural differences that can lead to communication problems in the classroom and suggests behaviors that affirm rather than devalue a minority student's culture. Since our educational institutions tend to reflect the norms and values of the majority culture, cultural misunderstandings often have a negative effect on a minority student's academic performance. This booklet assists teachers to recognize and utilize student diversity in ways that enhance academic identity.

Improving Black Student Achievement By Enhancing Students' Self-Image helps teachers to better understand the factors that contribute to a positive self-image for Black students and to design and implement instructional strategies that will enhance Black students' academic self-concept. While a positive academic identity is important for all students, it is a particularly critical issue for underachieving Black students.

Effective Schools for National Origin Language Minority Students provides highlights from a re-analysis of the effective schools literature, focusing on only those effective schools which achieved grade-level success with low-income and minority students over several years. Recent immigrants and children of immigrants, limited-English-proficient, and culturally diverse students have entered American schools in steadily increasing numbers over the past decade. Many schools have not been able to accept the challenge of change necessary to better serve these students, who frequently do not fit easily into the "traditional" classroom. Although the effective schools literature has produced a formula for change, this formula has not focused on what works for national origin language minority children. This publication reconsiders the effective schools research in its application to these students. In particular, policies and practices which have been shown to be effective with national origin children are discussed. Descriptions of effective schools serving national origin language minority children are detailed.

Sheryl Denbo, Ph.D., Executive Director
The Mid-Atlantic Equity Center

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank the staff of the Mid-Atlantic Equity Center for their assistance in the development of this document. In particular, I would like to extend my appreciation to Jill Moss Greenberg for her many questions, and Byron Williams for being there to get it all started. Special thanks to J. Michael O'Malley for his thorough review of the original and subsequent manuscripts, and to Diane August for her valuable comments.

The Mid-Atlantic Equity Center expresses its appreciation to Carolyn Kingsley, Julie Marshall, Leigh Ann Sours, and Michael Hires for their special efforts. The Center thanks Kathy Lyon for the layout and design of this publication.

Contents

I.	Introduction	1
	<i>Effective Schools Research</i>	1
II.	Issues Concerning the Education of Language Minority Students	3
	<i>Instructional Practices Which Preclude Access to</i> <i>Equity and Excellence</i>	3
	State Minimum Competency Testing	4
	Tracking	5
	Segregation	6
	Magnet Schools	8
	Discipline Policies	9
	Access to Technology	10
	<i>Instructional Practices Which Promote the</i> <i>Acquisition of English</i>	11
	<i>Cultural Differences in the Classroom</i>	12
	<i>Roles of ESL, Bilingual, and Regular</i> <i>Classroom Teachers</i>	13
	<i>Summary</i>	14
III.	Re-Analysis of the Effective Schools Literature	17
	<i>Effective Schools For Whom?</i>	17
	Cultural Pluralism	18
	Parent Participation	18
	Shared Governance	18
	Academically Rich Programs	18
	Skilled Use and Training of Teachers	19
	Personal Attention to Students	19
	Student Responsibility for School Affairs	19
	An Accepting and Supportive Environment	19
	Teaching Aimed at Preventing Academic Problems	19
	<i>Failure of Traditional Teaching Methods</i>	19
	<i>Effective Schools, Effective Programs</i>	20
	<i>Summary</i>	21

IV. Effective Schools and Programs: A Look at What Works For Language Minority Students	23
<i>Research Studies</i>	23
J. Calvin Lauderbach Community School	24
Three Elementary Schools	26
Lozano Elementary School	28
Six High Schools	29
<i>Common Processes in Effective Schools</i>	31
School Climate	32
Staff Characteristics and Staff Development	32
Collaborative Leadership	33
Quality of Instruction	34
<i>Interactive Processes</i>	34
Cultural Pluralism	34
Staff Development	35
Curriculum and Instruction	35
Involving Parents and Students	35
<i>Summary</i>	35
V. Conclusion	37
<i>Limitations</i>	38
<i>Future Directions</i>	38
Glossary of Terms	41
References	43



I

Introduction

Effective Schools Research

Research on effective schools supports the widely held assumption that schools *can* make a real difference in the lives of minority students, regardless of family and socioeconomic variables. It is doubtful, however, that effective programs for language minority students can exist in schools which are not themselves effective. It is also highly unlikely that more than one in one hundred segregated schools serving poor minority children is effective (Carter and Chatfield, 1986). These findings lead us to examine the interaction between a program of instruction and its larger school context.

Reports on effective schools have tended to ignore national origin minority students. Student data continue to be reported by school districts and state education agencies in broad categories, such as "minority." When school data on minorities are disaggregated into national origin subgroups (i.e. Chinese, Cuban, Dominican, Filipino, Hmong, Laotian, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, Salvadoran, Vietnamese) significant differences appear. Aggregate figures tend to conceal these differences and distort the educational needs of each group (Fernandez and Velez, 1985).

Educators familiar with the literature on effective schools know that the common practice has been to identify a formula which names attributes of effective schools. Among the attributes now believed to

correlate positively with gains in student achievement are (1) strong instructional leadership by the principal; (2) high teacher expectations for student achievement; (3) an emphasis on basic skills; (4) an orderly environment; (5) systematic evaluation of students; and (6) increased time on task (Edmonds, 1979; Lezotte, 1981). The practice of attributing a direct causal relationship between these factors and school effectiveness can be misleading, especially if it is done without in-depth analysis. Characteristics associated with effectiveness do not necessarily add up to produce an effective school. Furthermore, when schools adopt an "implementation of attributes" approach which follows a top-down change strategy from administration to classroom, there can be little hope for sustained effectiveness.

Effective schools and programs are produced by a set of dynamic interrelationships and processes at the school building level that function continually to maintain and improve school effectiveness. The concept of process suggests substantial modifications in intervention strategies and school administration practices. For example, in a study of an effective school serving national origin children, processes were found to be more determinant of effectiveness than structures or attributes. That is, there was little commonality of curricula, organizational arrangements, specific teaching methods, or classroom organization (Carter and Chatfield, 1986). Different processes may apply to different schools or aspects of the same process may have diverse manifestations in each school. No single formula can guarantee effectiveness for all schools serving national origin minority children.



II

Issues Concerning the Education of Language Minority Students

A number of issues concerning the schooling of national origin language minority children have been addressed in research and educational reports. Some of the key issues will be briefly outlined below to bring educators up-to-date on what schools and teachers can do to ensure academic success for national origin and limited-English-proficient children. These issues include:

- Instructional practices which preclude access to equity and excellence;
- Instructional practices which promote the acquisition of English and academic success for limited-English-proficient and fluent-English-proficient national origin students;
- Cultural differences in the classroom; and
- Roles of the ESL, bilingual, and regular classroom teachers.

Instructional Practices Which Preclude Access to Equity and Excellence

Research indicates that instructional practices such as suspension and retention, social promotion, testing, tracking, and ability grouping generally deny access to equal opportunity for language minority students. School policies which segregate national origin students are

discriminatory and result in negative educational attainment (Cummins, 1986a, 1986b; Desegregation Assistance Centers, 1989).

Recent school reform efforts such as grade-level testing and tighter discipline codes can exacerbate problems for national origin students if they neglect to take into consideration the cultural, linguistic, and academic needs of these students (Cusick and Wheeler, 1988). In particular, six school practices may discriminate against minorities if addressed with little regard for linguistic and cultural diversity.

These practices are:

- State minimum competency testing;
- Tracking;
- Segregation;
- Magnet schools;
- Discipline policies; and
- Access to technology.

(Desegregation Assistance Centers, 1989; Fernandez and Velez, 1985; Roos, 1984)

Each practice is discussed below in terms of implications for national origin language minority students, including recommendations for counteracting the negative effects of each practice.

State Minimum Competency Testing

In response to a report issued by the National Commission on Excellence in Education (*A Nation at Risk*, 1983), many state legislatures enacted laws establishing minimum competencies for high school graduates and standardized testing procedures to determine whether students were meeting these standards. This practice raises the possibility that language minority children will be disproportionately and negatively affected. For any student whose native language or language variety is not used in school, many tests not traditionally thought of as language tests may be primarily tests of language ability. Language aspects of tests exist even for native speakers of English. Virtually every kind of significant testing of national origin students depends on an assumed test of ability to use the language of the test (Oller, 1979).

State minimum competency testing has been enacted without regard to the serious consequences for racial and ethnic minorities and low-income children. If national origin language minority children fail to achieve the minimum competencies and are denied a high school diploma on that basis, they risk being excluded from obtaining a college education or any kind of promising career (Fernandez and Velez, 1985).

Limited-English-proficient and even fluent-English speaking national origin students tend to fall behind native speakers of English on minimum competency tests for many reasons. The competency testing movement generally assumes that students are fluent in English and that English is the only language of instruction and assessment (Gold,

1985). If language minority students' lower scores can be traced to discriminatory practices such as tracking or segregation, to unsuccessful programs, or to biased or inappropriate testing instruments or procedures, school districts can be held fully accountable and may be challenged in courts of law (Roos, 1988).

Educators should consider competency testing in languages other than English, avoid grade retention wherever possible, and clearly communicate with language minority students and their parents, in the language they best understand, the options for taking competency tests and meeting high school graduation requirements (Gold, 1985).

Tracking

Although many schools have become desegregated, in regular classrooms, instructional grouping practices frequently result in in-school resegregation. This occurs when students are assigned to classes on the basis of their level of academic achievement. This phenomenon, known as "tracking", is particularly pronounced at the high school level (Desegregation Assistance Centers, 1989; Fernandez and Velez, 1985; Moore and Davenport, 1989).

Academic (college preparatory), general and vocational curricula are designed to prepare students for very different futures. Because only those students on an academic track take college-oriented courses, a disproportionate number of minority students never attend college (Fernandez and Velez, 1985). Many schools do not offer even the minimal coursework necessary for college. For example, seven high schools in Chicago with predominantly minority enrollments made it highly unlikely that their students would enter college by not offering adequate courses in science, math and foreign languages (Orfield, 1984).

Failure to score at or above a predetermined level on standardized tests frequently results in placement of national origin students on a remedial instructional track. The danger in this practice is that too often remedial programs provide only a "watered-down" version of instruction accompanied with lower standards and lower teacher expectations. Courts have determined that tracking is illegal when it serves as an educational dead-end. In the case of limited-English-proficient students, these students are often inappropriately placed in classes for students with learning disabilities and speech impairments because language ability and cultural differences are often mistaken for learning disabilities.

In most states in the mid-Atlantic region, national origin students tend to be disproportionately represented in special education classes. No state in the mid-Atlantic region has yet developed guidelines for local school districts on procedures for identification and placement of limited-English-proficient students in special education classes (CCSSO, 1989). When schools fail to implement appropriate systematic assessment and pre-referral procedures which differentiate between language

skills and cognitive ability, students with limited English ability are assumed to have learning disabilities or mental retardation and placed in special education classes (Cummins, 1984a; 1984b; Fradd and Tikunoff, 1987; Garcia and Ortiz, 1988). This placement results in dead-end tracking which severely limits the educational options of linguistically and culturally diverse students.

Administrators need to be made aware of the dangers of tracking for language minority students, and teachers given guidance in instructional grouping which promotes interaction between students from both English and non-English language backgrounds for at least part of the school day. Scores on standardized tests in reading, math, and science should not be used as the principal criteria in determining student placement. Instead, a number of sources and different kinds of information about student achievement should be taken into consideration. These include alternative assessment measures of classroom performance such as: teacher checklists and rating scales of oral and written student performance, holistic literacy measures such as cloze reading activities (where students are asked to predict missing words from their context in a reading passage), writing samples, and teacher input.

School records of language minority and limited-English-proficient students at all grade levels should be reviewed by teacher/administrator/parent committees which take into account English language skills (both oral and written), length of residence in the U.S., and prior educational experience or lack thereof. These and other variables which play a role in student achievement through a second or non-native language need to be examined before referring these students to special education or remedial programs designed for native speakers of English.

Segregation

Although from 1968 to 1980 there was a decline in the segregation of Black students in every region but the Northeast, the segregation of Hispanics increased nationwide (Fernandez and Velez, 1985; Orfield, 1982). This is relevant because it has been shown that the quality of instruction is superior in schools in which White students are enrolled (Carter and Segura, 1979).

In spite of their diversity, in all regions of the United States, Hispanic students are segregated in public schools. These students are more likely to attend a predominantly minority school than their cohorts were twenty years ago. Hispanics also have the highest percentage of high school dropout rates of any other ethnic group in the United States (Desegregation Assistance Centers, 1989).

Race desegregation plans have mainly involved the use of strategies and educational programs aimed at correcting the harmful effects of segregation endured by Black students. These plans, which focus on numbers, particularly ratios of Black to White students, have placed in

a secondary role instructional approaches such as bilingual education, which aim at obtaining equity for limited-English-proficient national origin students. Achieving equity for all groups means that the educational needs of each group must be taken into account, and for national origin students, this often means bilingual education, English as a second language (ESL), or content area instruction with language support services. It also means hiring teachers and administrators who share the cultural and linguistic background of the national origin students they serve.

It is the responsibility of school districts to see to it that the equity rights of national origin students are protected during desegregation and its implementation. This requires that school districts:

- Fully identify and assess the educational and language needs of national origin students;
- Ensure compliance with both federal and state education mandates;
- Clearly define the status of national origin students and staff during desegregation;
- Not label national origin language minority students as "White" or "Black" for desegregation purposes. Rather, they should be afforded the status of an "identifiable ethnic language minority";
- Not set student enrollment ratios for desegregation purposes based on numbers of Black and White students only. Demographic data on national origin language minority students and projection data on the future growth of these students, should also be taken into account; and
- Ensure some "clustering" of national origin students to facilitate the implementation of language support services and programs, and to prevent isolation of these students in predominantly Black or White schools (Baez, 1986).

Even when they attend desegregated schools, Hispanic students may be segregated by classroom assignment patterns. English as a second language classes and bilingual programs can be used in ways that lead to segregation within a school (Fernandez and Velez, 1985). To counteract this, programs providing for face-to-face interaction between students learning English and native speakers of English should be structured into students' daily routine. Students needing English language and bilingual instruction should not be taught in isolation from their primary source of English language input — their native or fluent English-speaking peers.

A program model which may be used as a powerful desegregation tool is two-way bilingual education. This model brings English-speak-

ing children in direct daily contact with non-native speakers of English. In single classrooms, approximately half of the students are fluent in English and the other half are fluent in a language other than English. Instruction is designed so that after a period of time, the fluent English speakers have learned the native language of their peers and vice versa. Two-way bilingual education programs foster interaction between children of different cultural and language groups from an early age so that both groups have an opportunity to learn from one another and develop positive attitudes toward each other (Gold, 1988).

Two-way bilingual education is not to be confused with transitional bilingual education programs designed to *replace* a student's native language with English. The "quick exit" orientation of transitional bilingual education programs focuses on a single goal: development of English language proficiency as soon as possible. The majority of federally funded (K-12) bilingual education programs in this country are transitional. Although the federal government has been subsidizing foreign language instruction in 169 "critical languages" with the express purpose of increasing the nation's international competitiveness, many native speaking children of those languages have been encouraged to abandon them as quickly as possible. This has been referred to elsewhere as "*additive bilingualism* for English speakers and *subtractive bilingualism* for language minorities" (Crawford, 1989, p. 164).

Magnet Schools

Although magnet schools have been hailed by many as an effective solution to desegregation and the underachievement patterns of minorities, these schools frequently have a negative effect by excluding national origin language minority students. This may be because magnet schools tend to draw away from neighborhood schools only minority students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds. In a research study of four cities, magnet schools consistently tended to admit students with high basic skills test scores, good attendance, good behavior records, a mastery of English, no record of being held back, and no special learning problems (Desegregation Assistance Centers, 1989).

Magnet schools often appear to drain a neighborhood of its highest-achieving, model students, leaving neighborhood schools to face even higher concentrations of students with low basic skills. Magnet schools and programs may create a feeling of demoralization among educators, parents, and students. Many educators believe that students not admitted to selective programs are underachievers and consequently tend to lower their expectations for these students (Moore and Davenport, 1989).

Clearly, if magnet schools are to serve all students equitably, their admission policies need to be re-examined so that gifted and talented students from non-English language backgrounds are eligible to attend. This would mean entrance criteria which are not limited to grades,

standardized test scores on English language tests, English language proficiency, and attendance. Other student characteristics need to be considered, such as leadership qualities, interpersonal skills, and academic progress as measured by alternative assessment methods. National origin students should be compared to grademates with similar levels of English language proficiency. Programs can be implemented in magnet schools which place a high value on the ability to perform in languages other than English. On the other hand, if *all* schools offered challenging programs of excellence to their students, magnet schools would be unnecessary.

Discipline Policies

Without sensitivity to the cultures of national origin minority students, educators can misinterpret student behaviors and punish them inappropriately. This punishment often takes the form of suspensions and retentions. It has been shown that this kind of punishment frequently results in minority students dropping out of school and becoming another wasted human resource (Desegregation Assistance Centers, 1989; Taylor, 1988).

Some researchers and educators have suggested that effective schools tend to place less emphasis on rules and discipline than ineffective schools and that good discipline is the result of an effective school's organization and its positive, culturally-inviting learning environment (Ortiz, 1988; Stedman, 1987).

School policies which punish language minority students for speaking a language other than English in school need to be reconsidered in light of their negative effects on these students. Students who become alienated and suspicious of teachers and administrators because of these discipline policies cannot be blamed for giving up and dropping out. Often these students either do not know enough English to speak it, do not feel comfortable using their limited English skills, or simply prefer to interact with peers in their native language.

Communicating in a language other than English does not imply that students do not want to learn English, as anyone who has limited proficiency in a foreign language and has been forced to communicate in it for more than a few minutes can attest. Communicating in a second or foreign language can be a strenuous, stressful endeavor for persons who are not yet fully proficient in it, and sometimes language learners need a mental break by "relaxing" in their native language. Persons who have lived in non-English speaking countries and have had to function in other languages in which they were not proficient can understand this behavior. Because most public school teachers are not language minority persons and speak no language other than English, they need to be prepared for dealing with non-English speaking minority students through inservice courses which focus on the nature of

second language acquisition, as well as on cultural and linguistic diversity.

Similarly, student behavior and gestures can be misinterpreted by teachers and administrators who do not share these students' cultural background. For example, many national origin students from Hispanic backgrounds have been brought up in homes which value helping the weak and cooperating with others to get a job done. These students may find it difficult to relate to the individual competition rewarded by school systems in this country. Therefore, when a student with this kind of value system decides to help a peer in his or her classroom with an assignment or on a test, many teachers see this as cheating and punish the student accordingly. These behaviors need to be examined within the cultural context from which the student comes and proper assistance given the student, in the native language if necessary, to ensure that he/she understands that the behavior valued in the home is not welcome in the classroom. These culturally different students do not benefit from being disciplined for behaviors which are valued by their culture. Therefore, disciplining them may not result in preventing the behavior from reoccurring. Instead, a counselor or other adult who shares or understands the student's culture and language should be engaged to assist the student in understanding the school's value system.

Access to Technology

A disparity exists between the availability of computers in poor, inner-city schools having high minority student concentrations and more homogeneous, affluent suburban schools. Differences have also been noted in the way computers are used in the classroom (Roos, 1984). Middle-class students are more likely to be taught to use computers for problem-solving while low-income minority students are more likely to be assigned to computers to engage in drills and exercises.

To remedy inequities in access to computer technology, many schools have entered into school-business partnerships, where private companies or organizations "adopt" schools and provide both human and technological resources. Many businesses have distributed computers to inner-city schools when convinced of the need and benefits to students. Some grocery store chains reward schools that have their students submit cash register receipts totalling a certain amount. With a little creativity and lots of persistence, teachers and administrators in poorer school districts can obtain computers by submitting proposals to their school boards, state educational agencies, private businesses, and even the federal government.

Curriculum developers and classroom teachers need to be trained in locating and using computer programs for national origin language minority students which go beyond drills and exercise. Not only should

these computer programs challenge students to think and solve problems, they should be in a language in which the student can function. They should not be at a level which leads to student frustration. Not being able to speak or read English should not preclude students from access to computer-assisted instruction. Native-speaking teachers and paraprofessional staff can assist students who are not yet proficient enough in English to benefit from English language computer software.

Instructional Practices Which Promote the Acquisition of English

Many factors contribute to an individual's language aptitude or the facility and speed with which he/she acquires a second or foreign language. Among these, age, motivation, previous educational experience, and personality variables all play critical roles. Research indicates that younger children tend to acquire a new language more rapidly than older children. In addition, older children (up to age 12) with more educational experience (in any language) have an advantage in mastering school subjects over younger children. Children who have attended schools in other countries generally need less time to adjust to a classroom setting in a second language than do children who have never been in a classroom. Finally, highly motivated students who are willing to take risks and are not afraid of making mistakes make the best second language learners (Collier, 1987; Cummins, 1981a).

Second language acquisition research indicates that between four and seven years may be required for language minority students who are not fluent in English to acquire enough English to succeed on academic tasks in classrooms where English is the only language of instruction. In contrast, the oral language used to communicate personal needs and participate in everyday social interactions can be attained within two to three years (Collier, 1987; Cummins, 1981a; Cummins, 1981b).

The implication for instructional assessment is clear. There is a danger of inappropriate teacher expectations and classroom placement when limited-English-proficient students are placed in all-English classrooms on the basis of English oral language skills alone or minimal cut-off scores on English language tests. Minimal scores seldom produce optimal results. Although a non-native speaker of English may appear to understand and speak English fluently, we cannot assume that he/she has the literacy and academic skills necessary to function in an English language classroom. These skills must be assessed and students monitored carefully after being placed in regular (English-only) classrooms.

A substantial body of research exists which supports the positive effects of bilingualism and bilingual instruction (Cummins, 1986a;

Cummins 1986b; Hakuta and Gould, 1987; U.S. General Accounting Office, 1987; Willig, 1985). The research indicates that a well-designed, well-implemented program which utilizes native language instruction, as well as instruction in English or another dominant language in the setting, results in increased academic achievement for children in both languages (Cummins, 1981a; 1981b; Carter and Chatfield, 1986; Cazden, 1984; Hakuta and Gould, 1987). However, even well-designed bilingual programs must *operate within effective schools* to ensure the academic success of economically disadvantaged language minority children. It is doubtful that bilingual programs acting independently of an effective school environment are sufficient to produce sustained positive student outcomes (Carter and Chatfield, 1986).

Research on second language learning indicates that instruction is most effective when it includes the following practices:

- Emphasizes authentic communicative learning situations, as opposed to learning about language and its parts;
- Makes the English language "comprehensible" and meaningful to limited-English-proficient students, as opposed to involving meaningless drills and repetition;
- Minimizes anxiety and frustration by reducing error correction and encouraging second language learners to take risks and make mistakes, a natural part of language learning;
- Minimizes linguistic and cultural segregation of second language learners by providing opportunities for interaction with native speakers of English; and
- Maximizes use of basic cognitive mechanisms, such as learning strategies, hypothesis-testing and revision, generalization, and problem-solving, as opposed to concentrating on development of specific linguistic skills (Garcia, 1987).

Cooperative learning techniques have shown positive results with language minority and limited-English-proficient students (Cochran, 1989; De Avila, Duncan, and Navarette, 1987; Kagan, 1986; Slavin, 1981). Cooperative learning has positive effects on academic achievement as well as cross-cultural relations between students. Peer and cross-age tutoring have also shown success with language minority students (IDRA, 1986).

Cultural Differences in the Classroom

Language and culture play critical roles in the lives of many national origin language minority students, especially recent immigrants and those where a language other than English is the language of the

home. These students tend to respond positively to individuals who show that they value and respect the culture of the home. This can contribute to student self-esteem and lead to increased motivation and participation in the classroom (Cummins, 1986b; Garcia and Ortiz, 1988; Quality Education for Minorities Project, 1990; Stedman, 1987).

Teachers who show disrespect, whether intentionally or unintentionally, for the language or culture of the student or ask the student to leave his or her language and culture outside the classroom door undermine their own teaching effectiveness by reducing students' self-esteem and/or motivation to learn. Negative teacher attitudes toward a student's language and culture are reflected in teacher behaviors and can also serve to prevent students' integration into the school's mainstream culture (Saville-Troike, 1978; Taylor, 1988; Trueba, 1987).

Teachers who learn even a few words of a student's native language convey to the student that they are sincerely interested in reaching out to him or her. Learning proverbs in the student's language can also provide insights into the native culture. A teacher cannot reasonably expect a student to learn about the culture of the school if he or she is not willing to do the same for the student. This supports the interaction model of education.

Learning about differences between traditional roles of parents, teachers and children in this country and those of the student's native culture can provide useful insights and reduce misunderstandings. Knowing something about schooling in the student's country of origin, if the student is an immigrant with previous educational experience, can do much to explain student behavior in the classroom. Looking into the relationship between culture and learning styles can also help teachers modify their instructional practices to increase their effectiveness with youngsters from different cultural backgrounds (Dunn, Beaudry, and Klavas, 1989; Ramirez and Castaneda, 1974; Violand de Hainer, Bratt, Kim, and Fagan, 1986; Wong-Fillmore, Ammon, McLaughlin, and Ammon, 1985).

Roles of ESL, Bilingual, and Regular Classroom Teachers

All teachers in a school share equal responsibility for educating national origin and limited-English-proficient children. English as a second language teachers may spend only between thirty minutes to an hour each school day with students. Rarely do ESL teachers know each student's native language (Penfield, 1987; Waggoner and O'Malley, 1985). Teachers in most bilingual education programs communicate through students' native languages for only a fraction of the school day. It would be unrealistic and unfair to place the responsibility of educating limited-English-proficient children solely on the ESL or bilingual

teacher. All teachers are accountable for educating the limited-English-proficient children in their classrooms. It is up to each state and school district to prepare and enable them to do so.

To be more effective with students who are learning English, the regular classroom teacher can learn how to modify his or her language and teaching methods and materials (Chamot and O'Malley 1987; Watson, Northcutt, and Rydell, 1989). This can be done by working collaboratively with ESL and bilingual teachers on planning content-area lessons. In effective schools, regular channels for communication, cooperation and training are established among ESL, bilingual, and regular classroom teachers.

Summary

Instructional practices which preclude access to equity and excellence can be identified and addressed in the education of national origin language minority students. These practices include testing – especially state minimum competency testing, tracking and ability grouping, within-school segregation, magnet schools, discipline policies which result in suspension and retention, and limited access to technology.

Instructional practices which promote the acquisition of English for non-native speaking national origin students have been identified in the research literature. These include: appropriate assessment and placement in classrooms; well-planned and effectively implemented bilingual programs operating within effective schools; and instruction which focuses on learning content through language as opposed to learning *about* language and its parts. Effective classroom instruction for language minority students places the English language in meaningful classroom contexts as opposed to language drills, encourages learners to take risks and make mistakes, provides opportunities for interaction between native and non-native speakers of English, and develops critical thinking skills as opposed to specific language skills.

Cultural differences between student and teacher often lead to misunderstandings and student alienation. Teachers who show through their words and actions that they accept each student's culture set the foundation for earning student trust and respect and for promoting the subsequent desire to learn.

Contrary to popular belief, all teachers, including regular classroom teachers, share *equal* responsibility by law for educating national origin and limited-English-proficient students in their classrooms. Schools should train and encourage regular classroom teachers to work collaboratively with ESL and bilingual teachers to learn about students' cultures, learning styles, and effective instructional practices.

There are many things teachers and administrators can do to ensure that national origin language minority students attain success

in school. They can show that they care by acting on their high expectations for students. They can move students from remedial tracks to academic programs. They can be patient and not denigrate or reject the immigrant or native-born national origin student's culture or limited English ability. They can show respect for students' interests by showcasing them in their sports and arts of preference. And they can show parents that they really want to involve them by meeting them at a neighborhood or community site at a time convenient to the parents.



III

Re-Analysis of the Effective Schools Literature

Effective Schools for Whom?

Recent reviews of the effective schools literature have found evidence which contradicts factors traditionally associated with effective schools (Garcia and Ortiz, 1988; Purkey and Smith, 1983; Rowan, Bossat and Dwyer, 1983; Rutter, 1983; Stedman, 1987). Many schools described in the literature as having these factors were found to nevertheless manifest extremely low levels of achievement, with students averaging several years below grade level. Some researchers found little difference between high- and low-performing schools with regard to the presence of these factors. For example, researchers for one State Department of Education found that teachers in high- and low-performing schools showed no difference in rating the quality of instructional leadership (in both, teachers rated it equally high), in teachers' expectations for student achievement, and in teachers' classroom behavior. This would mean that the presence of the effectiveness factors alone did not always serve to differentiate high- from low-performing schools (Stedman, 1987).

In a recent synthesis of the effective schools literature, case studies were conducted for only those schools demonstrating grade-level success with low-income students over several years. This re-analysis produced findings significantly different from those generated by the

effective schools research (Stedman, 1987). Stedman found that successful schools actively developed students' racial and ethnic identities and paid more individual attention to students. Although an emphasis on cultural pluralism was strong, this feature appears to have been overlooked by previous reviewers of the literature.

The alternative "working" formula suggested by Stedman and which needs to be tested under controlled conditions groups school practices into a set of nine broad categories of highly interrelated practices. That is, as efforts are made in one area, other areas become easier to address. The nine categories are: (1) cultural pluralism; (2) parent participation; (3) shared governance; (4) academically rich programs; (5) skilled use and training of teachers; (6) personal attention to students; (7) student responsibility for school affairs; (8) an accepting and supportive environment; and (9) teaching aimed at preventing academic problems. Each of these practices is briefly described below.

Cultural Pluralism

Effective schools acknowledge the ethnic and racial identity of their students and display a great deal of sensitivity toward language minorities, such as by providing bilingual instruction, English as a second language programs, orientation for students, bilingual report cards and notices for parents, and role models for students. School staff view culture, class, and language differences as valuable resources which can enrich their schools rather than as obstacles to be overcome. Stedman notes that "by divorcing learning from culture, current reform efforts limit their chance of success" (Stedman, 1987, p. 219).

Parent Participation

School staff establish good communication with parents, including disseminating newsletters and notices in a language parents can understand, conducting home visits, and holding parent conferences. They also involve parents in their children's learning by helping them work with their children at home, involving parents as classroom volunteers, and stressing the importance of parents' role in insuring academic success. Effective schools often share school governance with parents.

Shared Governance

Instructional leadership does not depend solely on the principal. Teachers, parents, students, and administrators collaborate in running the school. Teachers may be involved in team planning and teaching.

Academically Rich Programs

Learning comes alive for students in schools that engage them in their own learning, involving them in talking and writing about personal experiences and local and national events. Teaching is not narrow, standardized, or drill-based. Basic skills are attained, but not at the expense of higher order skills and a liberal arts education.

Skilled Use and Training of Teachers

The best teachers are placed in positions considered to be most important, such as teaching in the primary grades and in remedial programs and serving as curriculum specialists and general trouble-shooters. Extensive use is made of inservice training which focuses on practical teaching techniques and on teacher collaboration.

Personal Attention to Students

Support from parent and community volunteers, teacher aides, and peer tutors allows more time for adult-student interaction by lowering student/teacher ratios. Extra attention is given to students needing help.

Student Responsibility for School Affairs

Students are actively involved in many of the daily activities of running a school, such as supervising the cafeteria, establishing a "clean patrol", appointing student "commissioners" for academics, discipline, and safety, and providing a forum for discussion of student concerns.

An Accepting and Supportive Environment

Effective schools take a relaxed approach to rule-making and strict discipline but manifest fewer discipline problems because of the way they are organized and their positive, culturally-inviting learning environments. Schools are seen as happy places where school staff have been enabled to provide encouragement and support to students.

Teaching Aimed at Preventing Academic Problems

Students may be given a head start by being taught to read early, and minor academic difficulties are addressed before these lead to serious academic delays.

Failure of Traditional Teaching Methods

The new working formula for effective schools described above parallels the framework identified by other researchers as being crucial for the academic success of national origin language minority students. Cummins (1986b) suggests that the main reason why educational reforms generated by the effective schools movement have failed to produce success for these students is that relationships between teachers and students, schools, and communities, have remained essentially unchanged. Traditional, teacher-centered methods of instruction based on transmission models of education continue to be the norm.

A transmission model of education sees the teacher's role as primarily a transmitter of information with students being the receivers of this information. Knowledge is transmitted from small parts to wholes

and language is frequently studied out of context. For example, weekly spelling tests focus on arbitrary lists of words selected by textbook publishers, not by students or teachers.

Recent research suggests that transmission models of education are not effective with minority students who are at-risk of failure in schools. This would include most non-English speaking immigrants, limited-English-proficient students from low socioeconomic backgrounds, and national origin minorities with long-documented histories of failure in American schools, such as Native Americans and Mexican-Americans in the Southwest and Puerto Ricans in the Northeast. For these students, reciprocal interaction models based on student collaboration have been shown to be more effective, (Cummins, 1986b). Reciprocal interaction models define the teacher's role as that of a facilitator, one who makes things happen by providing a learning environment which promotes student interaction and efficient questioning strategies necessary to the development of higher order skills.

Incorporating students' language and culture into school programs can be a significant predictor of their academic success. Schools that add to students' linguistic and cultural identities have more success with national origin students than those that attempt to replace these as a prerequisite for successful integration into the schools.

Cummins, like Stedman, acknowledges the importance of involving minority parents in their children's education, in providing reciprocal student-teacher interaction, and in implementing an advocacy-oriented assessment process. This process seeks not so much to legitimize placement in special programs as it does to identify variables in the learning environment – such as programs, staffing, curricula, and materials – which may be contributing to a student's lack of success and to make recommendations for achieving teaching-learning compatibility (Cummins, 1986b; Garcia and Ortiz, 1988).

Effective Schools, Effective Programs

In a study of effective bilingual schools for national origin students, Carter and Chatfield (1986) found that school staff were consciously self-analytical and produced a school climate supportive of high achievement, good attendance, and other positive student outcomes. Ineffective schools operated inefficiently and produced negative school climates and student outcomes. The bilingual program was an integral part of the total effective school.

Studies of effective schools for national origin children indicate that no single program, mechanism, or process encourages student learning. Instead, an aggregate of shared positive perceptions, values, and beliefs among students, teachers, and administrators, combined with appro-

priate supportive actions and programs lead to high levels of achievement (Carter and Chatfield, 1986).

Summary

Studies have shown that many schools, while implementing factors traditionally associated with effective schools, nevertheless failed to result in significant gains in student achievement. A re-analysis of the effective schools literature focused on case studies for only those schools demonstrating grade-level success with low-income students over a period of years. The re-analysis produced significantly different findings from those generated by the effective schools research. These findings indicate that effective schools actively developed students' racial and ethnic identities and paid more individual attention to students. The emphasis on cultural pluralism is clear.

Nine school practices associated with effective schools for culturally and linguistically diverse students are: (1) cultural pluralism; (2) parent participation; (3) shared governance; (4) academically rich programs; (5) skilled use and training of teachers; (6) personal attention to students; (7) student responsibility for school affairs; (8) an accepting and supportive environment; and (9) teaching aimed at preventing academic problems.

It has been proposed that traditional, teacher-centered methods of instruction based on transmission models of education cannot work for most language minority students. Instead, reciprocal interaction models based on student collaboration and which incorporate students' language and culture into the fabric of the school are more effective. Studies of effective bilingual schools for low-income, language minority students suggest that effective bilingual programs cannot exist within schools which are not themselves already effective for these students.



IV

Effective Schools and Programs: A Look at What Works For Language Minority Students

Research Studies

Recent findings on effective schools and programs for national origin language minority students have been reported in the literature primarily for Hispanic students receiving native (Spanish) language instruction. The absence of similar reports for other groups of language minority students and the absence of such data for ESL and English-only immersion programs points to the need for this information but also limits the discussion of effective instructional characteristics in such programs (Garcia, 1987).

Although no large-scale body of research is presently available regarding effective instruction in English as a second language (ESL) or English-only immersion programs, researchers have debated the effectiveness of native language instruction versus ESL and English-only instruction elsewhere (Baker and DeKanter, 1983; Hakuta and Gould, 1987; Hudelson, 1987; Rossell and Ross, 1986; Willig, 1985). National studies are currently underway which compare the effectiveness of these approaches. While researchers differ significantly regarding their recommendations, all agree that available research studies comparing various teaching methods and programs for language minority students contain significant methodological flaws (Garcia, 1987).

The schools and programs described in this section represent approaches and methods which have proven effective with language minority students. In general, these approaches appear to be based on reciprocal interaction, not transmission-oriented models of education. That is, schools allow for students to learn from each other rather than from the teacher alone. The teacher's role is that of encourager and facilitator of learning by preparing learning tasks and activities. The teacher is not viewed as a transmitter of information, nor are students seen as passive recipients. Students are active participants in the business of learning.

A number of schools have proven to be exceptionally successful with non-English-speaking, limited-English-proficient, and fluent English-speaking national origin students. Some of these will be described here. The schools selected include: (1) J. Calvin Lauderbach Community School in Chula Vista, California; (2) three elementary schools in Phoenix, Arizona; (3) Lozano Elementary School in Corpus Christi, Texas; and (4) six high schools in Arizona and California. Each school or set of schools will be briefly described with regard to history, demographics, program implementation, and student achievement data. This is followed by an analysis of processes which these successful schools appear to have in common.

J. Calvin Lauderbach Community School

Carter and Chatfield (1986) published one of the first and most detailed descriptions of an effective school serving national origin language minority students. In their report, they introduced two critical caveats regarding school effectiveness studies: (1) people and institutions, not the inherent characteristics of specific programs, cause those programs to succeed or fail; and (2) research on bilingual education and other instructional programs needs to take into account the relatedness of these programs to the larger school and school district context (i.e. policies, funding, resources, teacher support).

Carter and Chatfield's descriptive study focused on J. Calvin Lauderbach Community School and included data collected over a five-year period. Findings of the study imply that non- and limited-English-speaking children of low socioeconomic status can perform well academically in an effective bilingual program operating within an effective school.

J. Calvin Lauderbach Community School, located in Chula Vista, California just south of San Diego, was described as serving one of the poorest populations in its district. At the time of the study, the district was about 55 percent minority, predominantly Mexican or Mexican-American, although numerous other national origin groups were also represented. More than half of the Hispanic children were limited-English-proficient upon school entry. In addition to poverty and low

English language skills, the school was characterized by a 50 percent transiency rate.

In their study, Carter and Chatfield describe Lauderbach as a dynamic, continually improving institution which initiated and sustained a sense of direction, promoted instructional improvement, and sustained and improved the learning climate. Three types of evidence clearly supported the notion that poor children were learning as well as their middle-class peers. These included results from district language proficiency tests, the California Assessment Program (CAP), and standardized, norm-referenced tests.

Carter and Chatfield attribute Lauderbach's outstanding student outcomes to the very positive learning climate created and consciously maintained at the school. This climate was characterized by almost universal agreement on the humanistic goal to look at each child holistically and to help each student become a total person, a fully integrated and self-actualized human being. Both the district and the school were explicitly committed to bilingual education as an integral part, not an add-on, of the instructional program.

In addition, Lauderbach distinguished itself from ineffective schools in the following ways:

- There was a shared acceptance of goals and purposes;
- School staff actively and continually set objectives within the clear general goals;
- There was active involvement in school planning;
- Staff were cognizant of, agreed with, supported, and cooperatively addressed their mutually determined objectives;
- Tranquility, order, and courteousness characterized the school.

Carter and Chatfield suggest that no other factor contributed more to a positive learning climate at Lauderbach than the generally held belief by teachers that *all children can and will learn*. Staff expectations for student learning were exceptionally high. The staff was multiethnic; almost half were White and more than one-third were Hispanic. Teachers believed that if children did not learn, it was the school's fault. They did not blame the students or the home environment.

Ongoing leadership was provided by the school principal, who ensured that staff clearly understood and accepted their roles and responsibilities. The principal practiced management by spending most of the day walking around the school and visiting classrooms. On an average, the principal was in every classroom at least once a day. Supervision was geared to improving instruction by providing informal feedback.

In addition to the positive school climate and the leadership provided by the principal, Lauderbach followed an instructional program

characterized by a high degree of organization and coherence. The school's core curriculum was based on a set of objectives and a management system for monitoring student progress.

The school's bilingual program was offered in grades K-6 and was team-taught. One teacher taught in Spanish and the other in English. Collaborative teaching contributed to total school ownership of the bilingual program. Speakers of both languages were taught similar concepts in similar ways. Monolingual teachers and aides believed that the bilingual program was important and positive. The school's mission statement underlined the following goals: (1) common objectives for all students; (2) focus on teaching of basic skills; and (3) use of mastery teaching techniques.

Specific aspects of the bilingual program that appeared to be especially important were: (1) careful attention to the issue of reclassification (entry/exit criteria); (2) coordination between bilingual and non-bilingual curricular objectives and materials; (3) careful monitoring of student progress; (4) a high degree of staff acceptance of the bilingual program; and (5) a strong supportive volunteer program. These aspects interacted with other aspects of school organization and culture which were not specifically bilingual in nature.

Lauderbach ranked ninth among the district's twenty-eight schools in terms of academic achievement. By the sixth grade, very few children at Lauderbach were not reading in English. In almost every subject area for nearly every year, Lauderbach sixth graders scored better than grademates at comparison schools. These outcomes are important considering that almost 70 percent of all students at Lauderbach participated in the K-6 bilingual program. One-third of the children enrolled in the bilingual program were non-Hispanic, White native speakers of English.

Carter and Chatfield suggest that bilingual programs operating independently of an effective school environment are probably not in themselves sufficient to produce sustained positive student outcomes. This is important since many bilingual programs are found in ineffective schools where the overwhelming majority of students are poor, language minority children (Carter and Chatfield, 1986).

Three Elementary Schools

In a two-year investigation of effective schools serving Hispanic students, Garcia (1987) assessed characteristics and processes identified by Purkey and Smith (1983) and Carter and Chatfield (1986). The assessment consisted of interviews and an ethnographic description of the school and community environment. Processes and activities reviewed included: (1) instructional processes in literacy and mathematics; (2) academic and cognitive achievement; and (3) attitudes of principals, teachers, parents, and students.

Students in seven classrooms in three Phoenix area elementary schools (K-6) participated in the study. These schools were nominated by local educators as being effective schools; students were achieving at or above grade level on standardized achievement tests. Although the percentage of Hispanic students participating in the study was not specified, students from both "Spanish and bilingual language instruction classrooms" took part in the study (Garcia, 1987).

The seven classrooms had several significant characteristics in common. These included:

- (1) In each classroom the key emphasis was on ensuring functional communication between teacher and students and among students;
- (2) An integrated curriculum (language and content areas) was based on instructional objectives which revolved around themes;
- (3) Student collaboration occurred in almost every academic activity;
- (4) There was minimal individualization of work tasks; and
- (5) There appeared to be a highly informal, almost familial, social and collaborative relationship between teachers and students.

The review of instructional processes indicated that teachers organized classrooms in a manner which led students to interact with each other regarding the instructional topic. Student discussions were characterized by higher order cognitive and linguistic features. Students also tended toward increased use of English as they advanced through the grades.

The process used to analyze students' growth in literacy was the daily journal entry, where students communicated in writing with their teachers on topics of their choice. Results of the analysis indicated that writing in the native language progressed systematically in the early grades and that writing in the second language occurred at or above the level observed in the native language. A high degree of conventional spelling was observed in the early grades, and the quantitative and qualitative nature of journal entries was directly related to the nature of teachers' responses.

Several processes in the Phoenix schools resemble those of the Lauderbach school. For example, principals appeared to be highly supportive of instructional staff and articulate regarding curriculum and instructional strategies. Teachers were highly committed to the academic success of *all* students. In addition to being knowledgeable regarding theory-to-practice issues, teachers were involved in continuing professional development activities and in networking with other teachers. Each teacher felt that he/she had the autonomy to create or change the curriculum if necessary.

Parents, who averaged about 7.1 years of schooling, were quite satisfied with their children's schools. They actively supported instructional activities by helping students with homework, purchasing read-

ing materials, and strongly encouraging their children to succeed academically. Even parents who themselves could not read assured assistance through a child's siblings or peers or by inventing stories to match storybook pictures. As in Lauderbach school, students were actively supported by the principal, the teachers, and the community.

Investigation of academic and cognitive achievement supported the assumption that the average academic achievement in reading and math was at or above grade level, although students tended to score higher in math than in reading. In addition, a positive predictive relationship was observed between the cognitive measures (not named) and math achievement scores as well as between Spanish language proficiency and English reading achievement. These findings support research which has shown the positive cognitive benefits of high levels of bilingualism (Cummins, 1981b).

Lozano Elementary School

A successful school sharing many of the same processes and the dynamism of Lauderbach and the Phoenix schools, Lozano Special Emphasis Elementary School (K-6) was honored by the U.S. Department of Education in 1986 when it was nominated for the Elementary School Recognition Program. In a letter to the principal of the school, the Secretary of Education noted that Lozano School had been "uncommonly successful."

Located in Corpus Christi, Texas, Lozano Special Emphasis Elementary School was a prototype of four Special Emphasis schools established since 1982 to combat underachievement at schools populated predominantly by ethnic minorities. At that time, at least 35 percent of the students at Lozano were performing below average on standardized achievement tests.

Special emphasis schools were established as an alternative to court-ordered busing in an agreement resulting from a desegregation plan. These schools participated in a voluntary program of ethnic and racial integration and provided special programs to improve instruction. Termination of busing at the other Special Emphasis schools depended on the success of Lozano. The results were positive, and the district no longer has court-ordered busing (Texas Education Agency, 1986).

In 1986, Lozano Elementary School, located in a low-income community, enrolled approximately 90 percent Mexican-American students. Less than one-third of the community's residents over 25 years of age had obtained a high school diploma. The school's population was approximately 97 percent Hispanic. There was no sizeable group of recent immigrants or refugees; Lozano students had grown up in their community.

The program at Lozano was highly structured. The seven components of the Lozano Special Emphasis School were:

- A reading program which addressed spelling, grammar, and reading comprehension from an integrated perspective instead of as separate areas and content area lessons designed to reinforce skills practiced in the reading curriculum;
- Staff development on the reading curriculum and the importance of high teacher expectations;
- Community outreach efforts to develop a strong parental component;
- Lower teacher-pupil ratios (22 to 25 students per teacher)
- Hiring of additional staff;
- Individual selection of all staff by the principal; and
- Special financial incentives for all staff.

As a Special Emphasis School, Lozano's emphasis was on teaching basic skills. Characteristics of instruction included:

- Thorough planning of instruction to meet each student's needs as determined by diagnosis;
- Flexible grouping of students;
- Learning materials at each student's instructional level; and
- Close monitoring of students.

Before 1982, Lozano ranked in the bottom quartile of district schools. Today, Lozano ranks in the upper quartile of district schools, with students scoring above both district and national averages. Not only do standardized achievement test scores indicate that Lozano is the most improved school in the district, the school also boasts a low absentee rate, increased student motivation and self-esteem, and high levels of parent involvement (Pierce, 1988).

Six High Schools

Processes similar to those found in the aforementioned effective elementary schools were also found in an ethnographic study of six high schools in Arizona and California (Lucas, Henze, and Donato, 1989). These six high schools, which had successfully addressed the educational needs of national origin and limited-English-proficient students, were examined for: social context; student, teacher, and program characteristics; and the relationships between English as a second language, native language instruction, and sheltered courses. Sheltered courses are content-area courses in English which feature modified language and materials adapted for intermediate level limited-English-proficient students.

Students at the high schools were categorized into one of two groups: (1) recently-arrived immigrants called "newcomers," and (2)

long-time residents of the community called "non-newcomers." Of the non-newcomers, 90 percent reported speaking Spanish at home. Of the newcomers, 50 percent reported speaking Spanish at home. Most of the students came from relatively low-income homes.

Schools varied with respect to the percentage of national origin students in each school. While national origin students were predominantly Hispanic, other groups represented in the schools were Asian (Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese, and others), Pacific Islanders, Filipinos and Native Americans. In the six schools, enrollments ranged from 28 to 89 percent Hispanic and from 9 to 60 percent Asian/Pacific Islanders. The percentage of limited-English-proficient students ranged from 15.5 to 97 percent among the six schools.

Rather than a single program, various school practices were identified in the six high schools as being positively related to academic success.

Among these:

- Multiple assessment instruments were used to identify and place language minority and limited-English-proficient students;
- High teacher expectations of all students and subsequent policies and programs enabled students to attend college;
- The language and culture of the students was respected, not denigrated or prohibited, by school staff;
- Staff were often hand-picked by the principal in an effort to obtain minority and bilingual teachers or teachers trained in effective teaching methods for language minority and limited-English-proficient students;
- Principals were up-to-date on effective instructional and curricular approaches for teaching limited-English-proficient students and made the academic success of these students a priority;
- Staff development focused on the second language learning process, on effective instructional approaches for language minority and limited-English-proficient students, and on cross-cultural communication;
- Class sizes were limited to between 20 and 25 students to maximize interaction;
- Extracurricular activities were established to reflect the interests of the language minority and limited-English-proficient students, such as soccer, a ballet folklórico, and a Spanish language student newspaper. Cultural events and holidays of significance to language minority students were celebrated by the whole school; and
- Parents were offered evening ESL classes and encouraged to meet with school staff.

Some characteristics of effective instruction in the six schools included:

- Integration of language and content area skills, not teaching them as separate areas;
- Cooperative learning techniques; and a
- Focus on application of thinking skills, not rote learning.

Overall indicators of success for the six high schools were defined as better than average standings for schools with comparable minority student enrollments in the following areas:

- Improved average daily attendance;
- Lower dropout rate as measured by the State Departments of Education of Arizona and California;
- Increased numbers of students going on to college;
- Official recognition by the school district or state; and
- Increased standardized achievement test scores.

Common Processes in Effective Schools

This section describes characteristics and processes which the effective schools described above have in common. Stedman's formula of nine categories will be used to describe these characteristics and processes. The discussion which follows will examine the extent to which these nine categories appeared to exist across the schools and programs described above.

The nine categories described by Stedman are:

- (1) cultural pluralism
- (2) parent participation
- (3) shared governance
- (4) academically rich programs
- (5) skilled use and training of teachers
- (6) personal attention to students
- (7) student responsibility for school affairs
- (8) an accepting and supportive environment
- (9) teaching aimed at preventing academic problems

The nine categories will be organized within the following themes: (1) school climate; (2) staff characteristics and staff development; (3) collaborative leadership; and (4) quality of instruction. The Stedman categories are organized within these themes as follows:

School Climate

- An accepting and supportive environment
- Cultural pluralism

Staff Characteristics and Staff Development

- Skilled use and training of teachers

Collaborative Leadership

- Parent participation
- Student responsibility for school affairs
- Shared governance

Quality of Instruction

- Personal attention to students
- Teaching aimed at preventing academic problems
- Academically rich programs

School Climate

Of the four sets of schools examined here, all indicated that setting a positive learning climate or establishing collaborative relationships between students and teachers was a process that was essential to the success of language minority and limited-English-proficient students. Lauderbach Elementary School and the three elementary schools in Arizona named an accepting, safe, and supportive school environment as part of their success formula. Lozano Elementary School established a positive school climate with strict discipline policies and an emphasis on good citizenship skills. The six high schools encouraged students to value their culture and language in both curricular and extracurricular activities.

Cultural pluralism was promoted in the six high schools but not emphasized as much in the elementary schools. In the six high schools, students were allowed to speak their native language in school when the focus of instruction was not English; native language classes were offered at beginning and advanced levels; and extracurricular activities reflecting areas of interest to students (such as soccer, a bilingual newsletter, and folk dancing) were supported by school staff.

Staff Characteristics and Staff Development

Strong emphasis was placed among all effective schools serving national origin students on skilled use and training of teachers. High teacher expectations as determined by teacher attitude questionnaires and interviews were common themes. In particular, it was clear that teachers did not accept the cultural deprivation theory which holds that minority students cannot learn because the culture and language of the home are different from that of the school. Successful schools had teachers who did not blame minority students for failure. Instead, teachers and administrators saw themselves as sharing the responsibility for each student's success or failure. This meant being flexible enough to try to meet students' individual needs. High teacher and staff expectations for all students were reflected in course offerings, especially in the six high schools, which offered college preparatory courses.

In some cases, additional staff were hired to allow schools to implement programs for national origin students. In many schools, a crucial feature was individual selection of teachers by each principal. Whether or not a teacher was assigned a position at a school depended on the judgment of the principal. Teacher interviews revealed each teacher's sensitivity and commitment to minority students. New and relatively inexperienced teachers were not assigned to the students most in need of master teachers, such as first graders and students in need of individual assistance.

Successful schools also demonstrated continuing staff development which focused on instructional methods shown to be effective with minority students. Other courses included cross-cultural communication and instruction in the native language of the students, if a single large language group predominated. In many cases, teachers were provided with financial incentives for participating in staff development.

Collaborative Leadership

All schools reflected some type of collaborative or shared leadership in school policy goal-setting and decision-making. In all schools, the principal was seen as the instructional leader, providing ongoing leadership and direction with regard to curriculum and instruction and articulate in effective methods and techniques for teaching language minority students. In many cases, principals practiced management by observing classrooms on a daily basis. All principals of effective schools were generally supportive of staff decisions to implement programs and activities to promote the achievement and sociocultural integration of minority students.

Shared governance was evident in the high staff morale resulting from collaborative goal-setting and shared acceptance of school goals for language minority students. Where schools had bilingual programs, staff members were aware of the goals of these programs and supported them. Especially in Lauderbach Elementary School, staff were actively involved in setting school goals and planning programs. In the Phoenix schools, students were given responsibility for the physical appearance of their school as well as for respecting each other's possessions and rights.

Schools shared a common emphasis on getting parents involved in home learning and classroom volunteer activities. For many schools, this entailed providing school-home communication in the parents' native language or through bilingual newsletters. By getting parents actively involved in their children's learning, schools not only helped increase student achievement levels but also established vital links to community support.

Quality of Instruction

Effective schools succeeded in increasing individual participation of students in the learning process, engaging students in mastery of basic as well as higher order skills, and providing academically rich programs. With the exception of Lauderbach School, all schools emphasized student collaboration in classrooms such as through cooperative learning activities, lowered teacher/pupil ratios (20 - 25 students per class), increased interaction between teachers and students due to adoption of effective teaching techniques, and access to higher level academic programs as opposed to only basic skills courses. The study of Lauderbach School, while not specifying cooperative learning techniques, reported high task engagement and on-task behavior, with approximately two-thirds of the classes being at least 80 percent engaged. In all cases, instruction was aimed at preventing academic failure, not remediating it.

In general, the elementary schools appeared to focus on mastery of basic skills while also providing learning experiences requiring higher order thinking skills. At the high school level, students were provided with courses emphasizing thinking skills instead of those requiring memorization of rote formulas. A critical process which all effective schools shared was the integration of language and content. That is, students were not taught *about* language but were allowed to master language by using it in context, learning vocabulary and structures through lessons in subject areas such as mathematics or science. This process appeared consistently across all the effective schools described here.

Interactive Processes

As is evident from the re-analysis of the effective schools literature and the descriptions of effective schools serving national origin students, a number of interactive processes must be in place to make schools work for these students. These include:

Cultural Pluralism

- Informing teachers about students' native language and culture;
- Valuing the language and culture which students bring to school;
- Incorporating students' culture into the school's curricular and extracurricular activities; and
- Creating accepting, culturally-supportive environments, where all students and cultures have equal rights, where principals and teachers are aware of the educational needs of language minority children and of ways to address these needs, and where all teachers sincerely believe that being different does not have to mean being deficient.

Staff Development

- Teachers taking extra staff development courses to help them increase their effectiveness with these children and being provided with incentives for doing so;
- Teachers engaging in preventive, not remedial teaching; and
- Teachers and administrators providing students in need of special assistance with tutors and counselors sensitive to their culture.

Curriculum and Instruction

- Providing a curriculum rich in academic skills and not limiting it to basic skills only;
- Coordinating lesson plans and curriculum objectives between ESL, bilingual, and regular classroom teachers; and
- Encouraging student collaboration.

Involving Parents and Students

- Promoting shared governance between students, parents, and teachers.

Summary

Effective programs for national origin language minority students tend to reflect reciprocal interaction models rather than transmission-oriented models of education. That is, students are allowed to learn from each other by working collaboratively rather than by responding to teacher direction alone. A number of schools have shown exceptional results with language minority and limited-English-proficient students. Since most of these are elementary schools, more research needs to be undertaken at the secondary school level.

Although the effective schools described in this section did not share all processes, commonalities did emerge. Among these were: a healthy respect for cultural pluralism; staff development aimed at enabling teachers to deal with the special needs of linguistically and culturally different children; a curriculum which went beyond basic skills to the integration of these skills in the content areas; encouraging student collaboration and coordination in lesson planning and preparation between all teachers serving these students; and shared school governance between students, parents, and teachers.



V

Conclusion

School policies and practices in American schools can be identified which reflect insensitivity to the linguistic and cultural diversity of national origin students in classrooms. By ignoring or denigrating language and cultural differences, these policies and practices often preclude access to equal educational opportunity. Specifically, policies that tend to deny access to equity and excellence in public schools include ability grouping and tracking, social promotion, suspension and retention, and placement in special education programs based on tests which essentially measure English language ability and test-taking skills.

While the law protects national origin language minority students from the effects of discrimination, the effective schools movement has been largely unable to improve academic outcomes for them. Some researchers suggest this is so because traditional schools have become outmoded and because the relationships between students and teachers, teachers and teachers, and schools and communities have remained essentially unchanged (Cummins, 1986b; Stedman, 1987).

The most recent re-analysis of the effective schools literature focused on schools with significant increases in achievement, specifically grade-level outcomes, for low-income students over several years (Stedman, 1987). The results compare to those of other researchers in pointing to a set of dynamic interrelated processes (Carter and Chatfield, 1986; Cummins, 1986b). These include:

- Active acceptance and development of students' cultural and linguistic identities;
- Individual attention paid to each student;
- Shared school governance with parents, teachers, and students;
- Active, personal, and inherently interesting learning tasks;
- Instruction aimed at preventing academic problems;
- Placement of the most skilled teachers in the most critical classrooms and provision of inservice training which focuses on practical teaching techniques and teacher collaboration;
- Placement of responsibility for school affairs on students and responsiveness to student concerns; and
- Provision of an accepting and supportive environment for all students.

Although most of the schools described in the effective schools literature have been elementary schools, new studies are beginning to emerge which look at effective practices in middle and high schools, as well.

Limitations

Many of the studies described in this publication, while addressing various processes essential to effective schools, did not provide operational definitions for them. For example, "valuing students' culture" is a concept which cannot be easily measured because it is not expressed in terms of teacher behavior. On the other hand, something like "teachers in all subject areas will address in their daily lesson plans contributions of national origin minorities to their subjects, such as U.S. history, business, science or the arts" is a specific description of teacher behavior. More studies need to be conducted which examine on a case by case basis practices which are effective across language minority populations. In addition, effective processes need to be defined in functional, behavioral terms.

Judging from the literature, no single program, policy, or strategy can ensure equal educational opportunity or success for national origin language minority students in today's public schools. There are no quick fixes, no magic formulas, no instant remedies. Educational change and innovation are far too complex for simplistic, unidimensional solutions.

Future Directions

The purpose of this publication has been to provide educators not with fast and easy solutions, but with a brief overview of issues relating to the education of language minority students and processes found to

be held in common by schools shown to be effective with these students. Although not all effective schools manifested the exact same processes, there were some which they held in common and which have the potential for immediate applicability in school settings. It is important to note, however, that schools and classrooms must initiate change from within, and this necessitates beginning with teachers and school principals. These educators need to take it upon themselves to become advocates for language minority students, realizing that the future of these students (and of our society as we know it) is shared by all educators. When teachers and principals are committed to the academic success of all students, when they obtain the knowledge regarding theory and practical instructional issues to teach them, when they become involved in professional development activities which promote networking and collaborating with colleagues about what works for them, and when they feel autonomous enough to change the future for all students, then schools will become effective for language minority students.

Effective instructional programs cannot exist outside of effective schools. A single program cannot significantly affect the academic attainment of language minority students enrolled in ineffective or segregated schools. The debate on the effectiveness of bilingual programs versus ESL or regular classroom programs must move beyond its superficial level of "plugging in" certain program features and "pulling out" certain students and then looking for subsequent increases in student achievement. While student outcomes are primary indicators of learning, they cannot be taken as the measure of any program without first examining characteristics of the program itself and then how it functions in the larger school context.

It will take more research to verify those school policies and practices which need to be implemented systematically and to determine the complex relationship between these. It will probably take school-wide restructuring efforts to provide educational contexts which are conducive to learning and to success for language minority students, which endorse a policy of cultural pluralism, and which implement instruction which reflects an understanding of how students' linguistic, cultural, and other background characteristics influence learning (Garcia and Ortiz, 1988; Trueba, 1987).

Ensuring educational equity will necessarily require alternative measures of school effectiveness. This is because the way we measure effectiveness will determine the kind of schools we get. Placing emphasis only on standardized achievement tests means schools will remain structured to impart these skills. A focus on problem-solving in groups, creativity, essay writing, and critical reading skills, on the other hand, may lead to more flexibly organized and responsive schools (Stedman, 1987). A focus on interpersonal and cross-cultural communication

skills may prepare students for survival in the multicultural workplace as well as in the larger society.

Changing the current situation will take the commitment of every teacher and administrator. It will also take time to change the history of academic failure to one of equal educational opportunity and academic success for all national origin and limited-English-proficient students.

Glossary of Terms

National Origin:

A person's ethnic or cultural origin, acquired either by birth in a country other than the United States, or by being a direct descendent of a person born in the United States as a native American Indian or Alaskan or of immigrants born outside of the United States.

National Origin Minority:

Persons residing in the United States who do not share the Western European background of the majority of Americans. These persons may be native-born Americans, naturalized Americans, or undocumented immigrants and refugees. Many of these persons come from homes where a language other than English is spoken or may speak a native language other than English.

Language Minority:

Persons residing in the United States who come from non-English-language backgrounds, i.e., (1) who live in a household where a language other than English is spoken, (2) have a non-English language as their primary or first language, or (3) currently speak a language other than English.

Limited-English-Proficient:

Individuals who:

- (A) were not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English;
- (B) come from environments where a language other than English is dominant; and
- (C) are American Indian and Alaskan Native students and come from environments where a language other than English has had a significant impact on their level of English language proficiency... and, by reason thereof, have sufficient difficulty understanding, speaking, reading, or writing the English language to deny such individuals the opportunity to learn successfully in classrooms where the language of instruction is English (P.L. 95-561, November 1978).

References

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). (1988). *Teacher Education Policy in the States: A 50-State Survey of Legislative and Administrative Actions*. Washington, D.C.
- Baez, T. (1986). "Desegregation and Bilingual Education: Legal and Pedagogical Imperatives. Interracial Books for Children." *BULLETIN*, 17 (3,4).
- Baker, K. and A.A. DeKanter. (1983). "An Answer from Research on Bilingual Education." *American Education*. 40-48.
- Carter, T.P. and M.C. Chatfield. (1986). "Effective Bilingual Schools: Implications for Policy and Practice." *American Journal of Education*, 95 (1). 200-232.
- Carter, T.P. and R.D. Segura. (1979). *Mexican Americans in School: A Decade of Change*. New York. College Entrance Examination Board.
- Cazden, C.B. (1984). *Effective Instructional Practices in Bilingual Education*. A Report to the National Institute of Education (ED 249768).
- Chamot, A.U. and J.M. O'Malley. (1987). "The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach: A Bridge to the Mainstream." *TESOL Quarterly*, 21 (2). 227-249.
- Cochran, C. (1989). *Strategies For Involving LEP Students in the All English Medium Classroom: A Cooperative Learning Approach*. Program Information Guide Series, 12. Silver Spring, MD: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Collier, V. (1987). "Age and Rate of Acquisition of Second Language for Academic Purposes." *TESOL Quarterly*, 21 (4).
- Corpus Christi Independent School District. (1985). "Lozano Special Emphasis School: Every Child Can Learn." Descriptive Brochure. Corpus Christi, Texas.
- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). (1989). *CONCERNS*. A Concern About Educating Students: A CCSSO Survey of State Education Agency Activities. Washington, D.C. Crawford, J. (1989). *Bilingual Education: History, Politics, Theory, and Practice*. Trenton, NJ: Crane Publishing Co.
- Cummins, J. (1986a). *Bilingual Education and Anti-Racist Education*. Interracial Books for Children Bulletin, 17 (3, 4).
- Cummins, J. (1986b). "Empowering Minority Students: A Framework for Intervention." *Harvard Educational Review*, 56 (1). 18-35.
- Cummins, J. (1984a). *Bilingualism and Special Education: Issues in Assessment and Pedagogy*. Clevedon, Avon, England: Multicultural Matters, Ltd.
- Cummins, J. (1984b). "Minority Students and Learning Difficulties: Issues in Assessment and Placement." *Early Bilingualism and Child Development*, M. Paradis and Y. Lebrun, (Eds.) Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger.
- Cummins, J. (1981a). "Age on Arrival and Immigrant Second Language Learning in Canada. A reassessment." *Applied Linguistics*, 2. 132-149.
- Cummins, J. (1981b). "The Role of Primary Language Development in Promoting Educational Success for Language Minority Students." *Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework*. Sacramento, CA: California State Dept. of Education.

- Cusick, P.A. and C.W. Wheeler. (1988). "Educational Morality and Organizational Reform." *American Journal of Education*, 96 (2).
- De Avila, E., S.E. Duncan and C. Navarrete. (1987). *Finding Out/Descubrimiento*. Teacher's Resource Guide. Northvale, NJ: Santillana Publishing Co.
- Desegregation Assistance Centers. (1989). *Resegregation of Public Schools: The Third Generation*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Dunn, R., J.S. Beaudry and A. Klavas. (1989). "Survey of Research on Learning Styles." *Educational Leadership*, 46 (6). 50-58.
- Edmonds, R.R. (1979). "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor." *Educational Leadership*, 37. 15-24.
- Fernandez, R.R. and W. Velez. (1985). "Race, Color and Language in the Changing Public Schools." *Urban Ethnicity in the United States*. New Immigrants and Old Minorities, L. Maldonado and J. Moore, (Eds.), 29. Urban Affairs Annual Review. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fradd, S. and W.J. Tikunoff. (1987). *Bilingual Education and Bilingual Special Education*. New York: College Hill Press.
- Garcia, E.E. (1987). "Effective Schooling for Language Minority Students." *NEW FOCUS*, (1). Silver Spring, MD: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Garcia, S.B. and A.A. Ortiz. (1988). "Preventing Inappropriate Referrals of Language Minority Students to Special Education." *NEW FOCUS* (5). Wheaton, MD: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Gold, D. (1988). "Two Languages, One Aim: 'Two-Way' Learning." *Education Week*, 7. 24.
- Gold, N.C. (1985). "Competency Testing for Students." *Issues in English Language Development*. Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Hakuta, K. and L.J. Gould. (1987). "Synthesis of Research on Bilingual Education." *Educational Leadership*, 44 (6). 39-45.
- Hudelson, S. (1987). "The Role of Native Language Literacy in the Education of Language Minority Children." *Language Arts*, 64 (8). 827-841.
- Intercultural Development Research Association (IDRA). (1986). "Valued Youth Partnerships: Programs in Caring. Cross-Age Tutoring Dropout Prevention Strategies." San Antonio, TX.
- Kagan, S. (1986). "Cooperative Learning and Sociocultural Factors in Schooling." *Beyond Language: Social and Cultural Factors in Schooling Language Minority Students*. California State University, Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center.
- Lezotte, L.W. (1981). "Search for and Description of Characteristics of Effective Elementary Schools: Lansing Public Schools." *A Report on the Research Project, "Search for Effective Schools"*. R.R. Edmonds, (Ed.). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Lucas, T., R. Henze and R. Donato. (1989). "Features of High Schools that Promote the Achievement of Language Minority/ Students." Paper presented at the 22nd Annual TESOL Convention, San Antonio, Texas.
- Moore, D.R. and S. Davenport. (1989). "High School Choice and Students at Risk." *Equity and Choice*, 5 (1).
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

- Oller, J.W. (1979). *Language Tests at School*. London: Longman.
- Orfield, G. (1984). *The Chicago Study of Access and Choice in Higher Education*. A Report to the Illinois Senate Committee on Higher Education. Chicago: Committee on Public Policy Studies, University of Chicago.
- Orfield, G. (1982). *Desegregation of Black and Hispanic Students from 1968 to 1980*. A report to the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States House of Representatives. Washington, D.C.: Joint Center for Political Studies.
- Ortiz, A.A. (1988). "Evaluating Educational Contexts in Which Language Minority Students are Served." *Bilingual Special Education Newsletter*, 3. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin.
- Ortiz, A.A. and S.B. Garcia. (1988). *Schools and the Culturally Diverse Exceptional Student*. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Penfield, J. (1987). "ESL: The Regular Classroom Teacher's Perspective." *TESOL Quarterly*, 21 (1).
- Pierce, L.V. (1988). "Programs That Make a Difference. Special Emphasis Schools: Empowering Low Achievers." *FORUM*, XI (4). National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Purkey, S.C. and M.S. Smith. (1983). "Effective Schools: A Review." *Elementary School Journal*, 83. 52-78.
- Quality Education for Minorities Project. (1990). *Education That Works: An Action Plan For the Education of Minorities*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Ramirez, M. and A. Castaneda. (1974). *Cultural Democracy, Bicognitive Development, and Education*. New York: Academic Press, Inc.
- Roos, P.D. (1984). "Equity and Excellence." *Make Something Happen*. Washington, D.C.: Hispanic Policy Development Project.
- Roos, P.D. (1988). "Rights of Students Under Federal Law - A Guide for School Administrators." *Federal Statutes and Directives Regarding National Origin Students*, F. Gonzales (Ed.). San Antonio, Texas: Intercultural Development Research Association.
- Rossell, C. and J.M. Ross. (1986). *The Social Science Evidence in Bilingual Education*. Boston, MA: Boston University.
- Rowan, B., S.T. Bossat and D.C. Dwyer. (1983). "Research on Effective Schools: A Cautionary Note." *Educational Researcher*, 12. 24-31.
- Rutter, M. (1983). "School Effects on Pupil Progress: Research Findings and Policy Implications." *Child Development*, 54. 1-29.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1978). *A Guide to Culture in the Classroom*. Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Slavin, R.E. (1981). "Synthesis of Research on Cooperative Learning." *Educational Leadership*, 38 (8). 655-660.
- Stedman, L.C. (1987). "It's Time We Changed the Effective Schools Formula." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69 (3). 215-224.
- Taylor, O. (1988). *Cross-Cultural Communication: An Essential Dimension of Effective Education*. Washington, D.C.: The Mid-Atlantic Equity Center.

- Texas Education Agency. (1986). "Elementary School Recognition Program." Nomination Form. Austin, Texas.
- Trueba, H.T. (Ed). (1987). *Success or Failure? Learning and the Language Minority Student*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- U.S. General Accounting Office. (1987). *Bilingual Education: A New Look at the Research Evidence*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. (GAO/PEMD-87-12BR).
- Violand de Hainer, E., T. Bratt, S. Kim and B. Fagan. (1986). "Learning Styles: A New Approach to Teaching Limited English Proficient Students." *NABE News*, 9 (3). 3-4, 10-12. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Bilingual Education.
- Waggoner, D. and J.M. O'Malley. (1985). "Teachers of Children in the United States." *NABE Journal*, 9 (3). 25-42.
- Watson, D.L., L. Northcutt and L. Rydell. (1989). "Teaching bilingual students successfully." *Educational Leadership*, 46 (5). 59-61.
- Williams, L. (1985). "Lozano Elementary Discovers That 'Special Emphasis' Works." *Corpus Christi Caller Times*. July 21, 1985.
- Willig, A.C. (1985). "A Meta-analysis of Selected Studies on Effectiveness of Bilingual Education." *Review of Educational Research*, 55 (33). 269-318.
- Wong-Fillmore, L., P. Ammon, B. McLaughlin and M.S. Ammon. (1985). *Learning English Through Bilingual Instruction*. Final Report. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

NOTES